



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

3. — *The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes and its Results.* By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College. Volume I. *The Preliminary History to Edward the Confessor.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1867. 8vo. pp. xxviii., 650.

THIS volume is the work of one of the ablest of the new school of English students and writers of history, — a school distinguished by a juster sense of the true methods and objects of history than was possessed by their predecessors, as well as by sounder critical judgment and freedom from prejudice and preconceptions. It may be hard to surpass Gibbon in learning, or in power of condensed and vigorous statement and animated narrative, but his spirit and temper were at times unworthy of an historian, and are characteristic of a stage of intellectual culture very different from that of the present day.

Mr. Freeman displays in this new work the same qualities as were conspicuous in his unfinished "*History of Federal Government.*" His clear and manly style well represents the clearness and definiteness of his thought. His mind is fitted, alike by natural gifts and by solid acquisitions, for historical investigation. To shrewd common sense he adds a rare critical faculty, which aids him alike in his judgments of men and in his estimate of the value of evidence. His learning is ample, his research thorough; the mass of facts which he has accumulated and with which he deals never overpowers him, and his command over them is that of one thoroughly the master of his subject. His books belong to the class of critical and analytic, rather than to that of picturesque and living histories. His imagination is rarely roused, and he does not reproduce and describe the past, but narrates its events, and discusses the character of the chief actors in them, without combining events and actors in the animated and poetic drama of actual life. He is more engaged in determining the general features of an age, and the historic principles that underlie them, than in exhibiting the age in its manners, thoughts, beliefs, or whatever else made up its conscious life. He examines political institutions, sets out the boundaries of kingdoms, narrates the wars and migrations of the time, tells the lives of the kings, and makes in fine a history which is essentially critical and political, rather than constructive and social. In its kind his book is of the highest value, and its literary merits are so great as to secure to it a distinguished place among the chief historical productions of the time.

Its great excellence is very strongly defined, if it be compared with

the works of its author's most eminent predecessors in the same field, Augustine Thierry and Sir Francis Palgrave. Thierry is far more animated and picturesque in his narrative than Mr. Freeman; Palgrave has an occasional gleam of genius unmatched by his successor; but each of these historians had a theory to support, which warped their view of facts, and each was alike deficient in that critical spirit which is absolutely essential for the discrimination of truth concerning a period so perplexed as that preceding the Norman Conquest. Beside the advantage which Mr. Freeman possesses in coming after these writers, and having the results of their investigations at his service, his habit of mind fits him to form juster conclusions as to the real meaning of facts, and as to their relations, while his large and accurate knowledge of the history of other times and other peoples enables him to grasp his subject with a firmer hand, and to treat it with a broader intelligence.

The point of view from which Mr. Freeman writes is

"a deep and growing conviction that the history of the Norman Conquest, and indeed all later English history also, is constantly misunderstood, through a fatal habit of beginning the study of English history with the Norman Conquest itself. A confused and unhappy nomenclature hinders many people from realizing that Englishmen before 1066 were the same people as Englishmen after 1066. They thus fail to perceive that the Norman Conquest, instead of wiping out the race, the laws, or the language which existed before it, did but communicate to us a certain foreign infusion in all three branches, which was speedily absorbed and assimilated into the preceding mass." — *Preface*, p. viii.

The older and stronger elements of national life and character survived, and after a while made good their permanent supremacy. They were modified, but not destroyed, by the Conquest. The Conquest, says Mr. Freeman, "was something less than such conquests as form the main subject of history during the great Wandering of the Nations. It was something more than those political conquests which fill up too large a space in the history of modern times." "In a few generations," he says on another page, and the sentence is a little amusing in form, — "in a few generations *we* led captive our conquerors; England was England once again, and the descendants of the Norman invaders were found to be among the truest of Englishmen."

To understand then the Conquest aright, it is needful to have a clear notion of the condition of England and the English people at the time it took place, as well as of the preceding history of the conquerors themselves, and it is to these topics that the present preliminary volume is devoted.

The second chapter contains an exceedingly able statement of the

nature of the earlier Teutonic conquest of England,—the conquest which changed Britain to England. The summary sketch of the course of English conquest and its results displays Mr. Freeman's historic powers in a very high degree. The grasp of facts, the skill in setting forth the conclusions to be drawn from them, and the condensed fulness of the narrative, make this chapter a model of historical composition. Nowhere else is there to be found an account of this period of English history which compares in excellence with this.

Mr. Freeman's powers never show to more advantage, indeed, than in those passages of his work where its scope widens, and he is forced to present, in a condensed form, his estimate of national character, conditions, and development. His generalizations, based upon a careful study of facts, are controlled by practical sense, and never run into the region of vague fancy or speculative theory. His critical turn of mind, which gives to some portion of his narrative more the character of a discussion of authorities than of true history, is of the highest service to him in those parts of his work where he is least an annalist. His peculiar merits are conspicuous in the fourth chapter, which contains a sketch of the history of Normandy during the tenth century. The following striking passage concerning the Normans is a fine specimen of his style : —

“ The Scandinavians in Gaul embraced the creed, the language, and the manners of their French neighbors, without losing a whit of their old Scandinavian vigor and love of adventure. The people thus formed became the foremost apostles alike of French chivalry and of Latin Christianity. They were the Saracens of Christendom, spreading themselves over every corner of the world, and appearing in almost every character. They were the foremost in devotion, the most fervent votaries of their adopted creed, the most lavish in gifts to holy places at home, the most unwearied in pilgrimages to holy places abroad. . . . And they were no less the foremost in war; they were mercenaries, crusaders, plunderers, conquerors; but they had changed their element, they had changed their mode of warfare; no Norman fleets went forth on the errand of the old Vikings; the mounted knight and the unerring bowman had taken the place of the elder tactics which made the fortress of shields invincible. North, south, east, the Norman lances were lifted; and they were lifted in the most opposite of causes. Norman warriors pressed into the remotest East to guard Eastern Christendom against the first Turkish invader, and other Norman warriors were soon found to be the most dangerous enemies of Eastern Christendom in its own home. If the Norman fought by the side of Rômanos at Manzikert, he threatened the Empire of Alexis at Dyrrhachion. His conquests brought with them the most opposite results in different lands. To free England he gave a line of tyrants, to enslaved Sicily he gave a line of beneficent rulers. But to England he gave also a conquering nobility, which in a few generations became as truly Eng-

lish in England as it had become French in Normandy. If he overthrew our Harolds and Waltheofs, he gave us a Fitzwalter and a Bigod to win back the rights for which Harold and Waltheof had fallen. In the arts of peace, like his Mohammedan prototypes, he invented nothing; but he learned, adapted, improved, and disseminated everything. He ransacked Europe for scholars, poets, theologians, and artists. At Rouen, at Palermo, and at Winchester, he welcomed merit in men of every race and every language. He guided Lanfranc and Anselm from Lombardy to Bec, and from Bec to Canterbury. Art, under his auspices, produced alike the stern grandeur of Caen and Ely, and the brilliant gorgeousness of Palermo and Monreale. In a word, the indomitable vigor of the Scandinavian, joined to the buoyant vivacity of the Gaul, produced the conquering and ruling race of Europe. And yet that race, as a race, has vanished. It has everywhere been absorbed by the races which it has conquered. From both Sicilies it has vanished as though it had never been. And there, along with the Norman, have vanished the races which he used as his instruments, and which he alone taught to work in harmony. Greek, Saracen, and Norman have alike disappeared from the realm of Good King William. In our land the fate of the Norman has been different. He remains in his lineage and in his works, but he is Norman no longer. He has settled in every corner of the British islands; into every corner of those islands he has carried with him the inborn qualities of his own race; but in every corner of those islands he has assumed the outward characteristics of the races among which he settled. The Scottish Bruce or the Irish Geraldine passed from Scandinavia to Gaul, from Gaul to England, from England to his own portion of our islands; but at each migration he ceased to be Scandinavian, French, or English; his patriotism was in each case transferred to his new country, and his historic being belongs wholly to his last acquired home. In England itself the Norman has vanished from sight, no less than from Apulia and insular Sicily. He has sunk beneath the silent and passive influence of a race less brilliant, but more enduring, than his own. The Norman has vanished from the world, but he has indeed left a name behind him. Of him came Richard the Fearless and William the Bastard; of him came that Robert whose foot was first placed upon the ransomed battlements of the Holy City, and that mightier Robert who in one year beheld the Cæsars of East and West flee before him. And of his stock, far more truly than of that of Imperial Swabia, came the wonder of his own and of all succeeding ages, — poet, scholar, warrior, legislator, the terror and the marvel of Christendom and of Islam; the foe alike of Roman pontiffs and of Moslem sultans; who won alike the golden crown of Rome and the thorny crown of Salem; dreaded in one world as the foremost champion of Christ, cursed in another as the apostate notary of Mahomet, — the gay, the brave, the wise, the relentless, and the godless Frederic." — pp. 169 – 171.

Of the later portion of this volume, the part most interesting and most novel to the student of English history is that which relates to the Danish invasion of England, and the character of the Danish kings. For the first time the story of Cnut, and of his sons Harold

and Harthacnut, is told in such a manner as to bring out its historic relations and importance, and to give to the actors in it the habit and reality of life. Mr. Freeman has thrown much light on this perplexed period; and though his judgment of the interpretation of events may be in some points doubtful and disputed, it is at least founded upon a solid basis of original investigation.

The main defect of Mr. Freeman's *History* is due to that absence of sympathetic imagination to which we have already referred. He fails to enter into the inner life of the nation and of special individuals. History as a narrative of events is a barren study; it is only when the meaning of historic events as expressions of human nature and their influence upon human development are investigated, that it becomes fruitful and truly instructive. It is a work worth doing to evolve the order of facts from the chaos of legend and tradition, to seek the true sequence of events, and to trace the course of the stream of affairs; but it is a far higher work, and one which has been rarely accomplished, to show the actual conditions of mankind, to read through events and affairs the progress of the race in intellectual and moral development, and to discover and exhibit the force of those ideas which control action, and by which the fate and fortune of every nation and every generation are determined. Of the philosophy of history there is little in Mr. Freeman's book. Among investigators of the facts of history Mr. Freeman deserves a foremost place. The *Saturday Review*, in closing an able notice of his work, says:—

“There is evidently a powerful attraction for Mr. Freeman in the outer aspects of war and policy which throughout tends to lead him away from the examination of those deeper questions which lie beneath them. His book is not, we think, sufficiently penetrated with the conviction of the superiority of man in himself to all the outer circumstances that surround him. We are, of course, far from classing the ‘*History of the Norman Conquest*’ with the mere ‘*drum-and-trumpet histories*’ which Dr. Shirley so pungently denounced, but throughout there is too much of wars and witenagemotes, and too little of the life, the tendencies, the sentiments of the people. And this is the more remarkable, because, as Mr. Freeman so clearly puts it, it was just these, and not the constitutional outside of English existence, that the Conquest so powerfully affected. The social condition and progress of the nation Mr. Freeman has reserved till he can deal with it from the basis of the *Domesday-book*. But on the religious and intellectual life of Englishmen before the Conquest he is as silent as on the social, and it is remarkable that the one class of authorities on which he seems to have bestowed little attention is just the class from which alone we can derive any knowledge of the deeper feelings of their time; we mean the hagiologies. . . . Throughout, we may say, the subject of the Church is treated in a manner very unequal to its real importance and bearing on the development of England and its institutions.

Whatever may be its defects, however, the merits of the work are great and incontestable. It takes rank at once as the most learned and the ablest of all the narratives of our earlier history. In its firm grasp and unflinching application of the true principles of historic criticism, in the clearness with which it defines the true nature of our national development, it has laid down a groundwork for after historians such as we have never had before."

4. — *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church.* By HENRY C. LEA. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1867. 8vo. pp. 601.

IN all ages and among all nations religious enthusiasm seems to have found its most natural expression in some form of asceticism. The Jews, notwithstanding their strong desire for numerous offspring, attached peculiar sanctity to vows of continence; and the fierce intensity of the conflict between their animal passions and their ascetic zeal is evident from the fact that it was sometimes deemed necessary to resort to self-mutilation in order to conquer the fiery Israelitish blood. The Laws of Manu prescribe the severest austerities for the mortification of the flesh; but, with the practical common-sense so characteristic of the Aryan race, even in the midst of the wildest extravagances, such practices are forbidden until all the duties which man owes to society, and which are essential to the preservation of the species, have first been performed. The same code that promises the supreme good of absorption in Brahma as the reward of solitude and maceration, declares that the Brahmin who, "without having begotten sons, selfishly strives for beatitude, is destined to hell." Six centuries before the Christian era, Gotama Buddha founded a religion in which the strictest celibacy is imposed upon the priesthood, and many of its regulations bear a strong resemblance to the sacerdotal discipline of Latin Christianity. Like abstinence was inculcated by Pythagoras, and distinct traces of it are found in all the religious observances of antiquity.

Such being the almost universal tendency of pietistic fervor, it is not strange that, although Jesus himself was the least ascetic of men, his ardent followers early introduced into the Christian Church austere practices wholly foreign to his humane and liberal teachings. Fanciful interpretations were given to the plainest precepts, in order to prove the incompatibility of marriage with the functions of the Christian ministry. Even the fact that Paul's model bishop is described as "*filios habentem*," instead of "*facientem*," was perverted by dialectic subtlety into a plea for sacerdotal celibacy. The persistent efforts to impose